



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE FRAGMENT OF THE "SEFER HA-GALUY<sup>1</sup>."

THE editors of the JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW forwarded to me, with the author's consent, a proof of an article on the above subject by Prof. Margoliouth, asking me to subjoin any counter-arguments I may have to bring forward. Such confidence in the editor of the fragment of the *Sefer Ha-Galuy* makes the latter's duty all the more stringent, to discard all preconceived notions in favour of the text edited by him, and to approach the question in a purely objective spirit. I hope that my readers, and even Prof. Margoliouth himself, will admit that I have, at least, endeavoured to be strictly impartial.

The result arrived at by Prof. Margoliouth in his learned and ingenious inquiry is astounding. It amounts to this, that the fragment is no fragment at all, but a fabrication by some Karaite, composed after the year 962, and intended to serve as a lampoon directed against Saadiah Gaon, satirically imitating and parodying the latter's philological method and style, and inserting some of Saadiah's opinions. I call such result astounding, because no scholar, and probably up to the present moment not even Prof. Margoliouth himself, has ever detected this personation<sup>2</sup>.

But this can scarcely serve as an argument against Prof. Margoliouth's assertion, living as we do at a time of most surprising discoveries of monuments and MSS., buried in the earth. Why should not, for once, a discovery be made in a printed book? It is, therefore, purely and simply a question of demonstration. In one respect we

<sup>1</sup> [Editorial Note.—Dr. Harkavy wrote the following reply to Prof. Margoliouth on the basis of an unrevised proof of the latter's article. Dr. Harkavy was unable to introduce the slight changes in detail which the revision of Prof. Margoliouth's proof entailed.]

<sup>2</sup> Prof. Margoliouth, at the end of his article, refers to an eminent authority on Judaeo-Arabic literature, namely, to Steinschneider. But he does not notice that the latter expressed his doubts *before* my edition appeared. Afterwards he discussed some personal points occurring in the volume of my *Studien und Mittheilungen*, which deals with Saadiah (Berliner's *Magazin*, 1892, p. 260), but he does no longer speak of falsification. Nor did the late J. Derenbourg, whose special life-study Saadiah was, ever conceive the slightest doubt as to the genuineness of the fragment edited by me.

must certainly do justice to Prof. Margoliouth, he has not made the matter easy for himself. He has, industriously and sagaciously, collected a whole arsenal of weapons, and has brought forward a number of historical and philological objections, tending, in his opinion, to cast suspicion upon the fragment of *Ha-Galuy*. He also, honestly and candidly, has produced his whole critical apparatus, particularly such points as were taken from Saadiah's own writings. But there are a few things which Prof. Margoliouth has omitted to do, to the detriment of his inquiry. In my monograph on Saadiah's *Egron* and *Galuy* I gave, in the introduction to the former, all historical data known to me, and quoted all philological data in my notes to the text. The latter, however, were not subjoined to the *Galuy*, because the society *Mekitze Nirdamim* hurried on the publication. But, as will be shown below, the short text of the *Galuy* can be explained from references produced in the *Egron*. It is much to be regretted that Prof. Margoliouth, who so thoroughly discusses the second part of my work, entirely disregarded the first. He might have saved himself much trouble. Besides, he ignores also, inadvertently, of course, several data produced in my second part.

Before entering in detail upon the proofs brought forward by Prof. Margoliouth, I must preface two observations regarding the standard of judgment and the methods applied by him. As to the standard of morality he applies to the *Galuy*, we find that he compares quantities which are altogether incommensurable. He contrasts the calm and delicate tone employed in such works of Saadiah's as are of purely scientific character, to the violent, irritable, and, frequently, indecorous tone met with in the *Galuy*, without considering how different Saadiah's position was in either case. It is in most cases easy for us, who write our works, even our polemical writings, whilst seated in our comfortable studies in complete tranquillity of mind, to preserve calmness and politeness. This Saadiah also understood, and acted accordingly in his scientific works. But now consider the position of a man who, having risen, through his merits, to the pinnacle of social distinction, became involved in a struggle with a dishonest but powerful opponent. He succeeds at first in overthrowing his enemy, but afterwards succumbs to the latter's unscrupulous machinations and those of his party. Insulted, and even personally maltreated, Saadiah is obliged to wander about homeless, compelled to hide himself to save his life. This not being enough, mud was thrown at him in public manifestoes and lampoons; the filthiest slanders were levelled at him, and he was threatened with moral annihilation. Are we entitled to expect such a man to preserve polite and parliamentary speech when replying to such opponents?

What should we think of a musical critic, acquainted with Tamberlik's and Mazini's melodious song as heard in the theatre, who afterwards hearing them howl and screech in an unnatural voice when attacked in a forest by robbers and murderers, would come to the conclusion that these cannot be the same persons? On such occasions it is always as well to think of the Talmudic apophthegm אין אדם נחפץ בבעל צערו (Baba Bathra, 16 b).

In another respect also, the standard applied by Prof. Margoliouth has not taken the right direction; namely, in regard to the philological side of the question. Of course, if we were to take into consideration the newest edition of Gesenius' *Hebrew Dictionary*, together with the most recent comparative grammar of Semitic languages, bearing in mind at the same time our conceptions of style and poetical composition, it would be very easy to show that the fragment of the *Ha-Galuy*, seen in the light of the above-mentioned guides, appears to be an abnormal and tasteless production. But the question obtains quite a different aspect on considering that we deal with a product of the beginning of the tenth century, when Chayyug's great discoveries as to the triliteral nature of Hebrew roots, and the *verba quiescentia* and *defectiva* were still entirely unknown; when the Arabic-Spanish school of poetry had not yet arisen, when the *Paganim* were still the only masters of Hebrew poetry, and Kalir's productions were held to be standard works. That such were the conditions of the time can be seen from the first half of my work, cf. *infra*, and they account for the character of the *Galuy*, which thus presents nothing strange or striking. Considered in the light of the grammatical and stylistic knowledge of the time, it rather turns out to be a tolerable poetical production. More than this. Even if Saadiah's name had not been mentioned, an intimate acquaintance with Saadiah's grammatical and exegetical views, and with such of his works as have already been printed, should be sufficient to point to him as the author of the fragment of *Galuy*. All this will be further shown in detail.

After these preliminary remarks, we proceed to examine Prof. Margoliouth's objections to our text, and to see whether they really possess the value he ascribes to them. I shall observe the same order as he follows in his article.

1. Prof. Margoliouth asserts that, had the *Galuy* been translated into German or English, it would not have been taken notice of in connexion with the Ben Sira controversy; but since we possess it only in the Arabic original, and in a faulty Hebrew translation, alleged to be the work of a relation of Firkovich, the difficulty to form a judgment is considerably increased for many who are

interested in Ben Sira. I am very grateful to Prof. Margoliouth, that, in spite of my distinct notice (p. 149, and note 2 *ibid.*) that the Hebrew translation is mine, and that, at the time, I had not yet before me the one composed by a grandson of Firkovich, he yet asserts the contrary, probably, for the purpose of attenuating my fault. I have committed some errors of translation; these I have afterwards noted myself for the most part, and were at the time also noted by others (Prof. Bacher and Dr. Porges in *R. É. J.*). Not a single error of mine has, however, hitherto been discovered, which bears any reference to the genuineness of the Arabic original, which after all should be of the most importance to Prof. Margoliouth. But if no error of that nature occurs in my translation, and the Hebrew tongue in which it is composed must be known to all those scholars who alone can have a voice and a vote in the Ben Sira and *Galuy* questions, it is difficult to understand why a German or English translation of the *Galuy* would have been of particular use for Prof. Margoliouth's assertion. Can the *Krethi* and *Plethi*, can those who possess English and German but have no knowledge of Hebrew, express an opinion on such a complicated question, which enters so deeply into philology and Hebrew etymology? And what value would such opinion have for a man of Prof. Margoliouth's strict philological training?

2. Prof. Margoliouth looks for, and finds, support in an Arabic author, Abulfaradsh Ibn-Alnadim, who wrote about 987; his work *Fihrist* contains also additions leading up to the year 399=1008-9 (vid. Flügel's preface, p. xii). This author gives a list of the Hebrew canonical writings, and another list of Saadiyah's works. The former he says that he received from one of the most distinguished Jews (*דָּבְרֵי שָׁנָה* ז), but he does not give the authority from which he derived the second.

Whosoever knows anything about information from Arabic sources as to Hebrew literature should be able to gauge the value that is to be attributed to it, even if produced by otherwise trustworthy Mahomedan writers. It would be certainly an easy matter for Prof. Margoliouth to compile a thick volume about curiosities of that kind. Besides, if we wish to utilize the notice in the way of proof, we can only do so by accepting Prof. Margoliouth's many conjectures at the same time. Both lists of Abul-Faradsh were *presumably* given him by the same Jew. This Jew, who praises Saadiyah, was *presumably* either a pupil or a follower of the latter. But a pupil or follower of Saadiyah's would *presumably* also have known Ben Sira if the master had made use of him. If therefore that pupil had known anything about Ben Sira, he would *presumably* have given

information about him to the said Arabic author, who would have given him a place in his list.

But apart from the many-storied construction of this hypothesis, which deprives it of all force of demonstration in a controversial question, all its constituent parts are improbable in themselves. In the first place, the two lists can hardly have originated from the same source ; for the Arabic author designates in the first list "a distinguished Jew" as his authority, but in the second list, which follows immediately after, he refers to the opinion of "the Jews" at large (וְיִהּוּם אֶלְيָהוֹר), and not to that of "the same Jew," as is the custom with Arabic authors. In the second place, both lists scarcely originate from a pupil or learned follower of Saadiah's. As to the first list—apart from linguistic blunders, such as, for instance, סְפֵטִי, הַפְּטָרָה (בְּתַאֲרָאתִי, פְּסָקָה for (pl. אַבְּסָקָה for (בְּתַאֲרָאתִי) אַבְּסָקָה (probably not *status constructus* as Flügel conjectures, but an Aramaic form), &c.—the statement that the Torah consists of five parts, each of which is divided into two books (לְמִבְּנָה אַנְמָאָס וַיְנַקְּסָם כָּל לִמְמָס אֶלְיָהוֹר), can hardly have been made by a learned Jew. Nor is it at all possible that the notice, that Moses was the author of the Mishna, can have originated from a pupil of Saadiah's who was acquainted with the latter's writings, for Saadiah himself distinctly names Jehudah Hanasi as the author of the Mishna. Flügel's conjecture to *Fihrist* (ii. 2) that Deuteronomy = משנה תורה is meant here, is untenable ; for, firstly, the Arabic author had already mentioned the five books of Moses, and, secondly, it would contradict the description of the book as given in *Fihrist*, where it is stated : "the Jews take from this book their jurisprudence, the laws and the sentences; it is a comprehensive work in the Chaldaean and Hebrew language" וְמִנָּה יִסְתַּחַרְגֶּן אֶלְיָהוֹר). עלם אלפקה ואלשראייע ואלאחכאמ והו כתאב נביר ולנטה בסדאני ועבראני. This description can only apply to Mishna and Talmud, as Prof. Margoliouth also assumes.

The second list can, as little as the first, belong to a pupil of Saadiah's or to anybody who was intimately acquainted with his works, for it contains several absurdities, which, evidently, have their origin in ignorance and misunderstanding. Thus we know now, that Saadiah wrote, in the first instance, the Arabic translation of the Pentateuch, accompanied by a very diffuse commentary, of which latter fragments have been preserved in MSS., and quotations in Rabbinite and Karaite writings. Subsequently there arose the need of a translation only, without a commentary. Saadiah himself names the former work in the preface to his translation (ed. Derenbourg, p. 4) כתאב חפסיר אלטורה אלכביר, and the latter (*ibid.*) כתאב חפסיר אלטורה אלכביר

כחתב תפסיר אלתורה. The latter is described in *Fihrist* as : בסינטץ אלתורה נסקא בלבד שרה אלתורה נס. But instead of the former we find in the list something which makes no sense : "Explanation (or translation) of the third book of the second half of the Torah with commentary" כחתב תפסיר אלתורה אלתורה מושר (נץ). This could only have been written by an ignorant man, who had no knowledge of Saadiah's chief exegetical work ; for, in the first place, the Pentateuch is not divided into halves (נץ) but into books (ספר אספאר). Secondly, it contradicts Abul-Faradsh's own notice, as given above, that each of the five books of the Torah contained two books ; consequently, the third book can only be the first half of Exodus, which, again, cannot belong to the latter half of the Torah. Thirdly, we know that Saadiah's large commentary comprised the whole of the Pentateuch, a fact of which a pupil or follower of Saadiah's cannot possibly have been ignorant. Again, we find in the list an altogether fabulous book, which in *Fihrist* has the title of "Book of explanation (or translation) of the sentences of David" כחתב תפסיר אחכאמ דוד. Whatever may be the origin of this notice, it is enough to stamp the informant as ignorant in *Judaicis* and not as a pupil of Saadiah. After such examples, we cannot be surprised to meet with yet another curiosity in the same list, namely, a book of Saadiah's entitled : "Book of parables, divided into ten sections" כחתב אלאמתאל וחמש מקאלאות. Several conjectures have been made as to the origin of this false notice ; at any rate, the *curiosum* belongs to the original of the *Fihrist*, for the MSS. offer no various readings. Consequently its author can scarcely have been a pupil of Saadiah. One might object, that, after all, it is possible that the Jew had given Abul-Faradsh correct information, which, however, became corrupt by the latter's fault. This is, of course, possible. But even if we grant this, we are not able to make any use of the corrupt notices, and, at all events, the Arabic author loses all value for demonstrative purposes, such as Prof. Margoliouth is inclined to attribute to him.

3. Nor can I find any grounds for assuming, with Prof. Margoliouth, that a pupil or a follower of Saadiah would have inserted Ben Sira in his list. The first list only enumerates the canonical writings of the Jews, but the Talmud distinctly excludes the book of Ben Sira from the Canon (*Babli Sanhedrin*, 100 b and *Jerush.*, X, 1), and allows only citation of beautiful sayings (סילוי מעליותא) out of it. The same is found in *Midrash Rabba*, *Koheleth*, sub fin., and times out of number we find, in the old Jewish literature, the Canon quoted as the twenty-four books (ארבעה ועשרים), to the exclusion of the Apocrypha. Saadiah himself, in our fragment of the *Galuy*, points out that Ben

Sira, and the other books quoted by him, were secular books, and then we are to expect a pupil of his to count the Ben Sira in his list of canonical books! The only non-canonical book mentioned in the *Fihrist*, the Mishna, is only quoted *in parenthesis*, because it was alleged to have belonged to Moses. The Christians, on the other hand, always used to embody the Apocrypha in their Bibles, and for this reason Ben Sira is in the *Fihrist* also enumerated among the Christian holy writings.

4. Another proof that Saadiah could not have possessed the Ben Sira in the Hebrew original, Prof. Margoliouth believes to find in the circumstances that the author of the so-called *Chronicles of Jerahmeel* knew nothing of the Hebrew text and only knew the translation. But I do not think this argument to be valid, for the author of the said *Chronicles* lived, either in South Italy, according to Dr. Neubauer's conjecture, or, as Dr. Gaster recently tried to prove in his learned introduction to the *Chronicles of Jerahmeel*, p. xlvi, in Spain; at any rate, in Europe. He drew his information from Latin or Greek sources<sup>1</sup>. On the other hand, as I tried to show (pp. 198-203, a point not noticed by Prof. Margoliouth), Saadiah most likely discovered the original of Ben Sira, after his dismissal from office, among the hidden treasures of the Academy of Sura, together with the *Book of the Jubilees*, and other apocryphal writings, about which discovery contemporary information is extant (cf. Kirchheim's *Commentary to the Chronicle of the Tenth Century*, p. 36, and the parallel passages alleged, ibid. in the marginal note). The name Αποκρύφα (Apocrypha) had therefore, at that time, its real meaning in Babylonia. How could it, therefore, have been possible, for a European author, to make use of the original Ben Sira which was hidden in Babylonia? He had to be contented with European sources.

5. Prof. Margoliouth creates difficulties for himself where there are none, and in spite of my having satisfactorily explained everything. Namely, Saadiah's words: "I was then in Irak," refer to his first visit to Babylonia, at the beginning of the twenties of the tenth century, when he arrived there for the purpose of, conjointly with the Exilarch, David, and the chief of the Academy of Pumbeditha, Cohen-Zedek, bringing to a conclusion the struggle with the Palestinian Pretender, Ben Meir (vide my *Studies, &c.*, l. c., pp. 212-224). Of course, Saadiah returned home after the strife had

<sup>1</sup> I wish to notice, *en passant*, that the original form ονιας (Onias) is not, as it is believed, taken from the Greek, but from the Talmud (*Megillah*, ro a, *Menachot*, 109 a). This name is probably *Theophor*, and identical with ρην, only in the sense of a prayer: "God be gracious!"

been concluded and Ben Meir defeated. There is therefore an interval of *thirteen years* between Saadiah's first visit (921-2) and the time that he composed the *Galuy* (934-5), as I have fully shown (*ibid.*, pp. 145, 229). Prof. Margoliouth takes no notice whatever of all this, he puts irrelevant questions, gives useless answers, and invents unsuitable chronological data. He also tries to prepare artificial difficulties regarding the *Galuy* fragment, where everything is in perfect order, whilst, at the same time, he commits several small errors and inaccuracies, which are here of particular significance. Thus the date of Ben Meir's letter is not, as Prof. Margoliouth states, 923, nor even 924, but 1233 of the Seleucidean era = 921-2. There is just as little contradiction between the expressions "in Irak," and "in Bagdad," as there would be between "in England," and "in London." The former is a more general, the latter a more special expression. The Arabic Jews always use the term אַלְעָרָק for Babylonia, in contradistinction to אַלְשָׁאָם, Palestine (Syria). The Arabic geographers also identify the same. Thus e.g. Yakut, in his geographical dictionary (ed. Wüstenfeld, III, 631), writes: והָדוֹא אַלְזִי. דְּבָרֶנָּה עֲנָה מִן אַוְלֵל דְּלֵל עַלְיָן אַלְמְרָאָד בְּאַלְעָרָק אַרְצָן בְּאַבְּלָל. The expression מבני בְּלִי שֵׁם (l. c., p. 233, l. 12) does not mean "an unknown man," as Prof. Margoliouth translates it, but "of an unknown family," "of low descent," in contrast to the preceding (l. 11), נְכָבֵד בְּמִשְׁפָחָתוֹ, "honoured through his family," "of honourable descent."

6. The above-mentioned circumstance that Saadiah had found the original Ben Sira, in 934-5, in the library of the Academy of Sura, serves also as a reply to Prof. Margoliouth's questions: why Saadiah never mentions Ben Sira, either in his commentaries to the Proverbs, or to *Sefer Yetzira*, or in his כתאב אלאמאנאת, for these works were written before 934. The commentary to *Sefer Yetzira* dates from the year 931 (ed. Lambert, pp. 52-76), the כתאב אלאמאנאת was written in the year 933 (ed. Laudauer, p. 72), and there are several indications to show that the commentary to the Proverbs was written even earlier than this. It is also possible that the Gaon, on account of the aforementioned semi-prohibition in the Talmud, had at first scruples against citing from the apocryphal work unnecessarily. After he had been violently attacked by his opponents, because of his first edition of the *Galuy*, he permitted himself to make use of Ben Sira as a weapon of defence, since the book contains irrefragable proofs, that already in ancient times non-canonical books had the external attributes of canonical writings, and that, therefore, no reproach could be made him that he had given these attributes to his "book

of the Exiled" (for this meaning of *Sefer Ha-Galuy*, vid. infra). The former alternative appears, however, more likely.

7. Saadiah was of opinion that the punctuation and accentuation belonged to the period of the second temple, probably to the school of the ancient *Sopherim*. According to the results of modern historic-critical investigations, this was an erroneous view, for we can now maintain, with tolerable certainty, that our system of punctuation and accentuation did not exist before the second half of the sixth Christian century. Saadiah, as a scientific man, and also, because in all matters religious he took the Talmudic-Rabbinical Judaism for his guide, did not attribute any sacredness or obligatory function to the punctuation and accentuation, which is not mentioned in the old Rabbinical literature, although certain uncritical writers are of a different opinion. Thus, for instance, the author of the *Manuel du lecteur*, edited by the late Derenbourg (the real title being מוחברת החרניאן), Moshe Hanakdan, the Karaite Jehuda Hadasi, &c., who maintain that the punctuation and accentuation were delivered to Moses from Mount Sinai. The same view was only recently defended with much acumen and learning by Jacob Bachrach, now deceased, in a work of two volumes (ל"ד אשחדות עם ש"ד, Warsaw, 1897). Saadiah's opponents evidently embraced this same view as to the obligatory sacredness of the punctuation and accentuation. They reproached him bitterly with having dared to provide his productions with the holy attributes of the ancient Prophets. Apart, therefore, from the erroneous view, shared also by Saadiah, that the punctuation and accentuation belonged to antiquity, the Gaon's opponents committed another important error. Namely, they confused the notions of *ancient* and *holy*, an error which Saadiah avoids. We see the latter, in his interpretation of Scripture, frequently deviate from the conception of the accentuation, we also find that, although usually following the Targum of Onkelos and the Halachic exegesis of the Talmud, he very frequently opens up a way for himself, and, in his explanation of the text, deports himself in quite an independent manner in the face of the Agadic interpretation. Of course, a sound critique must, on this point, unhesitatingly side with the Gaon of Sura. It is, therefore, surprising that Prof. Margoliouth commits here the same error as Saadiah's opponents, and the inconsistent Ibn Ezra. He also confuses the notions of *old* and *sacred*. The drift of Saadiah's argumentation is that, in spite of the *antiquity* of the points and the accents, they are, nevertheless, not *holy*, as shown by the examples of Ben Sira and other secular writings. Prof. Margoliouth protests against this, and maintains that, if *old*, they must be *holy* and must not be meddled with, but if they are not *holy*, and if it is

permitted to deal freely with them, in the way the Gaon evidently does, in that case they must be young and of late origin. Prof. Margoliouth moves in reference to Saadiah in a vicious circle. In doing so, he entirely disregards that it is possible to consider the *whole system* of punctuation and accentuation as extremely old, and even as traditional, without, at the same time, believing in the traditional transmission of the points and accents of every word. Rashi's grandson, Jacob Tam, was certainly not more broad-minded than Ibn Ezra, and yet he writes unhesitatingly that the punctators and Massoretic writers have committed errors (טעו הנקרנים, ed. Filipowsky, pp. 11, 12).

The evidences which Prof. Margoliouth thinks he has found in the Gaon's commentaries to the Proverbs and to *Sefer Yetzira* for the lateness of the points and accents, are without force. In the former (ed. Derenbourg, p. 52) Saadiah accuses the new opponents (the Karaites), that, whilst the Rabbinites had fixed the number of chapters, verses, and words of the Bible, of which they had established the correct divisions, and noted how many times each word occurs therein, not a single one of the new opponents had been concerned in establishing the biblical text, the *plene* and *defective*, and the grammatical changes of the forms of words. The latter term may include the various forms of words in respect to conjugations and declensions, and also, in respect to punctuation and accentuation, for the Massora deals with both. It appears unintelligible how any indication of the lateness of punctuation and accentuation can be found in this remark. It is true, Saadiah afterwards deals specially with the Halachic traditions. But this proves, that, granted even Prof. Margoliouth's assumption that by the word אַשְׁכָּלָה the vowels are meant, the latter do not rank the same as the Halacha, and are not obligatory like the latter. But this only confirms the view developed in the *Galuy* as the profane character of the punctuation, in which there is nothing sacred. But there is no allusion here to its lateness.

Nor can anything be found in the passages quoted by Prof. Margoliouth from Saadiah's commentary to *Sefer Yetzira*, which would in any way contradict the views expressed in the *Galuy*. His objections to the method of reckoning the vowels among the letters can only be assented to. It is very doubtful whether the words דָקְרָן שֶׁרְאִיצָהָא, at the end of the commentary, ought to be translated, with Prof. Margoliouth, "a grammar of their sacred books." We should rather take it, with the editor Lambert, to mean: *comprendre le détail des préceptes (de Dieu)*; for neither in the פְּנֵים, nor anywhere else, is mention made by Saadiah of an ancient Hebrew

grammar. Moreover, if Prof. Margoliouth's translation were correct, the term נָתַן אֶלְשָׁרָאִיעַ or דָקְרוֹן כְּתָבָב אֶלְשָׁרָאִיעַ would be required. But granted even that Prof. Margoliouth's translation is right, yet it would be impossible to conclude from the circumstance that Saadiah attributed the establishment of the rules of grammar to the same scholars who transmitted the laws and the oral tradition, or, in other words, to the oldest Talmudical Rabbis, that according to the Gaon the points were rather *late* than *ancient*.

8. As to Eleazar ben Irai, I willingly admit, as I have already observed (l. c., pp. 204-5), that the reason why Saadiah attributed to him a saying of Ben Sira is still unknown. I only wish to add here, that there is a possibility, that in the copy of Ben Sira, which was in the hands of the Gaon, the first three chapters, or, at least, the sheet containing the third chapter, was missing, or that, by an error of the copyist, verses 20-21 had been omitted, and that therefore Saadiah quoted these verses in the way they were transmitted by the said Eleazar. But whatever the cause may have been, the fact that this same passage was quoted in the commentary to *Sefer Yetzira* in the name of Eleazar shows that Saadiah had before him a work of Eleazar's in which that passage occurred, and that he had forgotten the citation from Ben Sira as mentioned in the Talmud and the Midrash. Such a lapse of memory on the part of the Gaon in the year 931 (commentary to *Sefer Yetzira*) may very well have recurred in 934 (*Ha-Galuy*). Under no consideration can this accident constitute a reason for suspecting the genuineness of the *Galuy* fragment, in which we also become acquainted with two verses from Eleazar's own production. These latter are all the more interesting, because they belong to those literary productions that served Saadiah himself as a pattern of elevated style. I see from Prof. Margoliouth's Essay that the verse, or verses, quoted in the name of Eleazar, occur also in Dr. Schechter's edition of Ben Sira. (That edition is, unfortunately, not accessible to me, and I must, therefore, refrain in these observations from discussing the "Ben Sira" itself.) But I do not know in how far the verse in Dr. Schechter's edition is in accord with that quoted in *Ha-Galuy*, and in the commentary to *Sefer Yetzira*, in which the text is in complete agreement (except for the unimportant difference that in the latter בְּלָי occurs, instead of the second בְּנָי in the former). Prof. Margoliouth completely ignores my conjecture (l. c., p. 204), that the Eleazar mentioned in *Yerushalmi*, *Chagiga* (66 d, 73 c), *Bereshith Rabba* (c. 8), and *Tanchuma*, *Miketz* (ch. 10), who produced citations from Ben Sira, was, perhaps, identical with Eleazar Ben Irai. I will add here two more sentences of Eleazar's, which seem to have been taken from Ben Sira: טמוֹנוֹ שֶׁל

לעולם קדמים אדם חפלה לצרה ; וסאמא מקימי רגלא (Babli *Sanhedrin*, 44 b, cf. Ben Sira, ibid., XVIII, 11 : ערך לא חמץן עקרתא צלא).

9. Prof. Margoliouth takes things very easy in respect to the book of the Maccabees, which is quoted in *Ha-Galuy*. He simply ignores everything set forth by me (l. c., pp. 208-9). He disregards the mention of *Megillat Beth Hashmonai* in the *Halachot Gedolot*, to which attention was already drawn by Rappoport, and which passage in the latest critical edition of that work (Warsaw, 1874, p. 282) was carefully noted by me. He only consults the notoriously late recension of the Vatican manuscript, into which an obvious mistake has crept, which was already pointed out by the editor (p. 615, note 9), and observes in a dictatorial manner: "but this is an error." Prof. Margoliouth should be a little more cautious in matters of Jewish literature when dealing with Rappoport.

Again, Prof. Margoliouth makes no mention whatever of the evidence of Nissim of Kairouan in *ספר המעשיות* (written about 1030-50), which was also referred to by Rappoport and by myself. In the Hebrew translation of that work, hitherto known, the Book of the Maccabees is called *מנגלת חשמנאי*. But according to the Arabic original, discovered by me, the title was (*Steinschneider-Festschrift*, Hebrew part, p. 19); almost the same as in *Halachot Gedolot*. It is known that, in the latter work, the authorship of the book is ascribed to the elders of the schools of Shammai and Hillel. Let us now see how Nissim expresses himself about it: פאנני לא אכלייה מן ذכר חדיות נורי לאלמת אגמע פי צקקה כאנו פיהא ותפראנו מנהא סי' מא הו מדון מטל מנגלת אסתור ומגלאת בני חשמנאי וסאיר מה חזטמנה אלארבעה ועשרין ספרא ממא נורי עלי אלאבא ואלאוין מן אלמאציק ("I shall not neglect to tell in this book the events that happened to the nation, when they were in distress and were rescued, with the exception of such as have already been described, as for instance the *Megillat Esther* and the *Megillat Bni Hashmonai*, and all that is found in the twenty-four books about the oppressions and misfortunes that have befallen the fathers and the patriarchs and from which they were delivered; for all this has been described already and is found everywhere"). Consequently, this testimony of Nissim proves that as early as the beginning of the eleventh century, the Book of the Maccabees was already universally known in eastern countries as the biblical books. This fact is confirmed also by old oriental MSS. of our book and of prayer-books in which the latter is embodied in connexion with the

feast of Hanucah. I noted such MSS. from Yemen from the beginning of the fourteenth century (l. c., p. 209); afterwards, I had the opportunity of seeing MSS. of that book which date, at the latest, from the twelfth century, but belong more likely to the eleventh. Such data have, after all, quite a different value from that of an occasional phrase of Jellinek's that the book was a later liturgical work, a phrase quoted by Prof. Margoliouth with evident complacency. From the present standpoint of Jewish science we can rather maintain that the Book of the Maccabees was just as little composed for liturgical purposes (and in the Middle Ages forsooth!) in order to be read on Hanucah as the Pentateuch was written for the purpose of being recited at prayers, or the Prophetic books for the sake of the Haphtarot, or the Book of Esther for the Purim liturgy. In the first place, there is no trace in the book itself of any liturgical use, else it would have concluded with some form of prayer for the present and the future times (something like "as the Lord has helped us miraculously at the time of the Maccabees, so may he," &c.); secondly, in that case, the liturgical use of the book would have been much more extended. But we find that it is not in use at all in western countries, and the writers on decisions and ritual do not know it; only Isaiah di Trani, the older, who lived in the thirteenth century, quotes it, and even in the east, it was only very sparingly made use of in the liturgy. The inference is obvious, that it was not written for liturgical purposes but as an historical work. Thirdly, up to the present time, we know of no historical book written in the Middle Ages in pure Aramaic (*Seder Olam Suta*, *Seder Tanaim Ve-Amoraim*, and the Epistle of Sherira Gaon were written in the mixed Talmudic-Aramaic dialect). For this reason also we must assume that the Book of the Maccabees belongs to antiquity. The positive assertion of the *Halachot Gedolot*, that the work belonged to the schools of Shammai and Hillel, is therefore by no means objectionable; it is much more objectionable to declare that a work, which was already considered as ancient at about the middle of the eighth century, was a late compilation of the Middle Ages. Not a single alleged indication of a late authorship, which Prof. Margoliouth tries to establish by the aid of philology, can be decisive of anything in regard to our question, for it is impossible for us, at the present time, to maintain categorically, that such and such a word, which is at the present day known to us only from kindred Semitic dialects, could not have been in colloquial use in Palestine in the first Christian century. Many words in the Mishnah and Gemare can only be explained by us with the aid of Arabic, but nobody will therefore assert, that this points to Mahomedan influence. In

addition to this, there is the circumstance that as yet no restoration of the text of the Book of the Maccabees according to the oldest and best MSS. has been undertaken, so that it is possible, that some words have found their way into it from the hands of later copyists. But if the work belongs undoubtedly to antiquity and not to the Middle Ages, it would be historically unjust to demand of Saadiah, that he ought to have recognized it to be non-Maccabean, according to the light of the critical aids at our disposal. He produces the grounds that induced him to attribute to Abraham no more than the ideas contained in the *Sefer Yetzira*, but not the text as it stands; these grounds could be discovered even at his time, but not those which prove that the book in question was not Maccabean. And if he himself did not believe in a Maccabean authorship of the work, he might, for all that, have made use of it as an argument against his enemies, believing as they did in the latter. It was, at any rate, good enough for them, their reproaches and accusations against the Gaon were thus proved to be unfounded.

10. We have now arrived at that part which should form the main point in Prof. Margoliouth's criticism, namely, the philological part. I have already alluded to it, but it deserves to be more specially dealt with. I called the philological side of the question the most important one, because if treated scientifically, and with regard to a Babylonian writer of the tenth century in the position of Saadiah, it cannot possibly rest on purely personal ideas and considerations of that which is fit and unfit, proper and improper, &c. Nor can a philological critique base itself upon hypothetical, mere arbitrary chronological, or moral combinations, &c., by the aid of which a literary controversy can scarcely be finally decided. On the other hand, it is easy for so thorough a Semitical linguist as Prof. Margoliouth categorically to prove with the aid of documents, from a philological standpoint, that which is possible and that which is impossible. For the literary monuments of each epoch and of each writer are, on the whole, known and recognized by the students. We might therefore expect that the chief attack against the *Galuy* fragment would be made from that quarter, should we really have a supposititious document before us. For, not even the most subtle falsifier of texts has as yet succeeded in imitating his counterfeit productions so artificially, that the critique could not detect in it some treacherous weak point. Unfortunately, Prof. Margoliouth has refrained from making use in his criticism of those decisive points which are offered us in the history of the Hebrew language, of the development of the Hebrew poetical style, of the observation of the mannerisms of the neo-Hebrew writers in general, and of those

of the tenth century in particular. More than that, Prof. Margoliouth forgot, most peculiarly, to take into consideration the philological position and the poetical style of Saadiah himself, notwithstanding the fact, that these are the most momentous ones in regard to our question, and should occupy the principal place. Instead of this, he again enters on excursions into remote and vague subjects, and is contented with referring to conjectures, and even to incorrect assertions.

I shall therefore be permitted to make some introductory remarks on these points :—

(a) It is known that Abu Zacaria Jahia Chajjug (at the end of the tenth and the beginning of the eleventh century) was the first to make the important discoveries of the triliterate nature, and of quiescence and defectiveness, of Hebrew roots. Until that time, biliteral, and even monoliteral roots were universally assumed, and there existed a rule, that radical letters could never disappear in the various grammatical permutations of the roots. Consequently, the absence of one or another letter in the words of the Bible proves that such letter could not have belonged to the root, but was merely an additional (servile) one. They therefore considered the *verba quiescentia* and *defectiva* as biliteral roots. This is not only illustrated by numerous instances taken from the Pajetanim, proofs of which can be found in the appendices to Zunz's *Synagogale Poesie*, but Saadiah distinctly enunciates it (in the first part of my work, p. 57, ver. 25 of the *Egron*). It was also recognized by his opponent Mubashir (*ibid.*, pp. 71–73), by Ben Asher and Menachem ben Saruk (מחברת, *passim*), and Dunash does not object to it. It is easy to verify from the above-mentioned lists of Zunz, that the Gaon acted upon that principle in his poetry, which, to him, was identical with Pijut (vid. *infra*), e. g. אָוֹתָהּ תְּהִיא (from תְּהִיא, Num. xxxiv. 7), גַּר (from גַּנְגָּד, thus also Kalir), חַזְבֵּן (for חַזְבֵּה, like Kalir), עַטְמָה (for עַטְמָה, like Kalir), עַשְׁ (for עַשְׁה, like Kalir), צְוֵי (for צְוֵה, like Jose ben Jose and Kalir), צְתֵחָה (for צְתֵחָה, like Kalir), רְשֵׁי (for רְשֵׁי). These examples Zunz took from the Gaon's *תְּרִינְגְּ מְצֻוֹת עֲבוֹדָה*, אֶזְהָרוֹת, which are printed in *קובץ מעשי יורי נאונים קדרמוניים* (Berlin, 1856). We could add now several other instances from Saadiah's *חושענות*, printed by the late Kohut; e. g. חַנָּה (for חַנָּה, like Kalir), חַקְקָן (for פְּצָקָן, like Kalir), צָרָר (for סְפָר צִירָה and Kalir), דַּרְדָּר (from פְּצָה, like Kalir and Ben Asher).

(b) We know now that the Gaon had a deep respect for the Pajetanim, Jose ben Jose, Jannai, and particularly for the prolific Eleazar Kalir. This appears from the passages collected in the first part of my work (pp. 51, 107–110), in which he calls them “the

ancient poets" (אֲלָשׁוּרָא אֲלֹאַוְיָן), and "the excellent poets" (אֲלָפָאַגְּלָן). He quotes examples from their poems in his dictionary, written especially for the use of poets (אֲנָגְרוֹן). We noticed before that he imitated Jose and Kalir in his liturgical poetry. But in his secular rhetorical epistles he also followed Kalir's style (וְתוּן דָאִימָן) ; this is evident from his commentary to the *Sefer Yetzira* (p. 23 ; where the correct reading seems to be מְחַטֵּבִ בְּרֻכּוֹת, חַטְבָּה, חַטְבָּה) . Saadiah's method was the same as that of the Pajetanim, who sought to increase and expand the Hebrew vocabulary by the creation of new, and often unsuccessful forms of nouns and verbs, by the frequent use of *hapax legomena*, and by employing Targumic and Talmudical terms. Besides the great number of examples of words of that kind used by the Gaon, which have already been given (l. c.), and which could be considerably augmented, we know now, that even in his exegetical works, and in his secular Hebrew productions, he did not shrink from the boldest interpretations and formations of words. It is greatly to be regretted that the little book, *Kritik des Dunasch ben Labrat über einzelne Stellen aus Saadia's . . . Schriften*, edited by R. Schröter (Breslau, 1866), seems to have been entirely unknown to Prof. Margoliouth. He would have found there that Saadiah, e. g. explained בְּנֶר (Gen. xxx. 11) as מְדִינָם (No. 14), מְדִם (Ps. xvi. 4) as בְּאַהֲרֹן (No. 18) ; that he derived בְּהַותּו (Ps. lii. 9) from הָוּן (No. 20), נְבָדְנִי (Gen. xxx. 20) from בְּבָתּ (No. 21) ; that he identified זָרִים (Isa. i. 7) with זָרָם (No. 23), לְחוּמִי (Deut. xxiii. 24) with חָום. Dunash quotes, in the same booklet, any amount of such monstrous words of Saadiah's, as הַזְּגָדָה אֲזָהָה אֲזָטָטָם (from the interjection אֲזָהָה, הַזְּגָדָה), אֲזָטָטִים (from אֲזָטָטִים), עַזְּקִיפָּה (from the proper noun קָעָזָה), אַזְּתָּחָתָה (from אַזְּתָּחָתָה), וְתַּזְּהַבְּתָה (from אַזְּהַבְּתָה), אַזְּתָּחָתָה (from אַזְּתָּחָתָה), אַזְּתָּחָתָה (from אַזְּתָּחָתָה). Prof. Margoliouth should be consistent, and apply his hypothesis also to the Saadiah's liturgical poems, and to the passages just quoted from Dunash, and maintain that they are only satires against, and parodies of the Gaon's works. Again, to be fully consistent, Prof. Margoliouth ought to apply the same assumption to many passages in other works of Saadiah's, which he himself recognizes to be genuine, e. g. the *Commentary to the Proverbs*, xxx. 1 (ed. Derenbourg, p. 183), where יְקָה is derived from בְּחַלְקָה, וְקָהָל from אַיִתְיָאָל, בְּחַלְקָה from מְוֹלָל, and לְמוֹאָל from אַיִלְוָתִי ; also to many other passages in the Gaon's works, which are in no way superior to those in *Ha-Galuy* to which Prof. Margoliouth takes exception. We see, therefore, that Prof. Margoliouth's method would lead us too far.

11. Having thus prefaced some general remarks about Saadiah's position in reference to language, we can now proceed with the consideration of Prof. Margoliouth's philological observations on

the short text of the *Galuy* fragment. We shall again see that Prof. Margoliouth's criticism of that text is quite untenable.

Prof. Margoliouth writes: "The first sentence alone contains two words unknown to the Dictionary, רָאשָׁה and חַסְנָה." To this we reply that רָאשָׁה is a *hapax legomenon*, occurring in Ezek. xxviii. 17, and it is quite legitimately used in Saadiah's elevated style. For apart from the innumerable examples of the use of *hapax legomena* and rare forms (Arabic *نَوَارِد*) employed by the Pajetanim and Spanish poets, and also in the Gaon's liturgical productions, we find also two examples in his brief rhetorical address in his commentary to *Sefer Yetzira* (p. 23), וּמִתְחֹזֵי (Gen. xxi. 16) and חַצְנִי (Isa. xl ix. 22, and two more places); not less than five instances in the address (apparently to the Academy of Sura) in Dunash's *Critique*, No. 87: בְּרִקְתָּה (Exod. xxviii. 17), רָאשָׁות and יְהָלֵם (ibid., xxviii. 18), אֲחָלָוּם (formed from אֲחָלָה, Exod. xxviii. 19); several examples in the preface to אָגָרָן (in my work, first part, pp. 52-7), e.g. ver. 2: עָדִיו יְיַעַצֵּל (Num. xi. 25) and עָדִיו (Mic. iv. 8 and Job iv. 5); ver. 3: לְהַקְתָּה (1 Sam. xix. 20) and נְפָלָנָה (Gen. x. 25); ver. 4: לְהַהְרָר (Eccles. iv. 13), וַיַּפְצֹן (1 Sam. xi. 11 and 2 Sam. xx. 22), בְּחִמָּם (Jer. li. 39), and הַעֲתִירָות (Deut. xxxii. 35); ver. 5: רִיעָה (Isa. xv. 4) and וַתְּחַצֵּן (Dan. xi. 4), &c., &c.

We are also able to give the authority for the other impugned word חַסְנָה, which occurs in *Ha-Galuy* as synonymous to אֲוֹצָר, in the sense of "treasure," "treasured store"; namely, Isa. xxxii. 18, where the *hapax legomenon* חַסְנָה is also used synonymous to אֲוֹצָר. In Saadiah's translation, *Oeuvres compl. de Saadia* (III, 1896, p. 33), both words are rendered by two Arabic synonyms, one of which is, just as in the *Galuy*, formed from the root בָּזַז. It is therefore to be regretted that Prof. Margoliouth did not include the third volume of the *Oeuvres compl.* among his critical apparatus; had he done so he would have found in the impugned word rather a confirmation of, than an objection to, Saadiah's authorship.

Prof. Margoliouth writes further: "גִּינָה, in the next line, is from the Targum of Job." In regard to this we wish to observe, that granted even that Saadiah considered the word גִּינָה as *Targumic*, there would yet be nothing surprising in the fact of the Gaon making use of it. Saadiah followed the example of biblical poetry, in which Saadiah, after Dunash's *Critique*, declared the words לְמִיחּוֹת מִלְבָנִים (No. 26), וַיַּחֲרֹנוּ (No. 27), בַּיִקְרָה (No. 40), לְמִיחּוֹת מִלְבָנִים (No. 48, cf. the *Commentary to Proverbs*, xxxi. 3, ed. Derenbourg, p. 197) and others to have been borrowed from the Aramaic, and in which, after the method of his well-known little work, there are over seventy (91)

words which must be explained from the Targum and the Talmud. This was the method he applied to his poetical productions. Thus, in his liturgies he constantly makes use of Targumic and Talmudic words, and in his vocabulary, אָגָרְוִין, specially composed for the use of poets, he included words from the Targum and the Talmud. Cf. the first volume of my work (pp. 69, 71). The impugned word can certainly have been used by Saadiah, for Zunz showed already (*Synagogale Poesie*, p. 394) that Saadiah had used the word נִיחָה, probably as a *nomen actionis*, in a *Selicha*, and that Kalir also had used the word נִיחָה (p. 390). We have already seen that Saadiah held Kalir in high esteem and that he was fond of imitating him (cf. *infra*). We would therefore be entitled to assume *a priori*, that if נִיחָה belonged to Saadiah's vocabulary, the same may have been the case with נִיהָ. This is now confirmed by the *Galuy* fragment. But we can go even further than this. Zunz and Prof. Margoliouth consider נִיהָ as Aramaic; this is philologically correct. But for Kalir and Saadiah, the word was pure Hebrew, because, according to their grammatical views, that the פֶּנֶגֶב verb נִגְנַה, of which the Bible has the forms יִנְחֵה (2 Sam. xxii. 29) and יִנְחַה (Job xviii. 5), נִגְנַה only could be considered as the root, and they could form נִיְנַה from נִגְנַה, analogous to פִּתְחַה (in their opinion formed from פְּחַה) and שִׁתְחַה (in their opinion formed from שְׁחַה).

Prof. Margoliouth proceeds: "The word נִשְׁמַה is exceedingly faulty for נִשְׁמָה." The reply to this is, that according to my remarks (l. c., pp. 23, 181, 188–9, 192, 238) the use of the incriminated word is fully justified. I showed there that, according to Saadiah's own evidence, it was a universal poetical custom in those days to transform feminine into masculine words, that Saadiah himself had, most probably in another fragment of *Ha-Galuy*, transformed לְעֵנָה into לְעֵן, and that Saadiah's pattern, Kalir, also used the word נִשְׁמָה. All this is entirely disregarded by Prof. Margoliouth, although, I think, that it is, at least, worthy to be refuted. I can now add, that many similar words used by Saadiah belong to the same category; e. g. אהָלָם, quoted in Dunash's *Critique*, from the Biblical אֲבָחָלָמָה, in his עֲבוֹרָה (p. 12), from אֲבָכָת חֲרֵב (Ezek. xxi. 20), (טְנַפְּךָ, ibid., p. 13) from the Talmudical word טְנוּפָתָא, Aramaic זְמַר, טְנוּפָתָא (p. 14) from אהָב, זְמַר (p. 15) from אהָבָה, &c., &c. But the matter is clinched by this, that already Zunz (ibid., p. 384) cited the *corpus delicti*, the word נִשְׁמָה, from a liturgical poem of Saadiah's, commencing with the word תְּקִרְאָה שְׁפִתִּי קִינָה (Saadiah's dirge *תְּקִרְאָה* is probably meant, vid. *Literaturgeschichte der synagog. Poesie*, p. 97).

Prof. Margoliouth says further: "The form مُلْحَبَّة is not Biblical, but Arabic." This cannot be asserted so offhand, for we have already

in the second verse of Genesis the form מברחת (Isa. xl. 9), cf. מברחת (1 Sam. i. 13), מברחות (1 Kings xi. 8), &c., &c. Saadiah has himself אונרן in מספראת (l. c., p. 54, ver. 12). Prof. Margoliouth probably meant to say that a verb was formed here from the noun להב, but such mode of proceeding is sufficiently known to us from Saadiah's poetical productions. I quote a few examples: In the he has אָשֶׁל from השיל, שולי, שולים from עבדה (p. 10), פולסא from פולסה, ויללה from הוליל (p. 12), from the Talmudical רפטם from נְבֵש (Ezek. xlii. 11, p. 13), &c. In a fragment quoted by me (p. 189) from תחbatchת בַּחֲתָת (Esther i. 6). Most instructive are in this respect the instances quoted by Dunash in his *Critique* (No. 88), for we learn from them, that the Gaon formed אות from רת, דותית from דת, and even transformed proper nouns like קוע, and interjections like אהה into verbs!

אלכתאב אלטארד ספר הנלי and present difficulties to Prof. Margoliouth, as they did to other critics before him, but without reason. I have already given the only correct explanation (l. c., pp. 142, 180), namely that the words mean "the Book of the Exiled" (of the exiled one), I only forgot to add that we ought to read in the Arabic כתאב אלטאריד (or also אלטדר, in a passive sense), just as in the Hebrew the word נלי is taken as the passive of גלות (to exile). Thus he has also in the other fragment (p. 189) חכבי, analogous to the Biblical רצוי, and in Ben Sira. After my above remarks about Saadiah's artificial style, Prof. Margoliouth will, I hope, admit that my explanation does not prove at all that "Harkavy strangely prefers the barbarous Hebrew to the correct," &c., but that every author must be judged according to the conditions of his age, according to the linguistic stage of his period, and, principally, according to his own works and mannerisms.

12. Having thus shown how groundless Prof. Margoliouth's reasons are for suspecting the work, it will be sufficient only briefly to refer to the remaining points of his criticism, which rest either upon premises, which can be proved to be incorrect, or upon arbitrary assumptions, and I shall only enter upon a detailed discussion of the following remarks should the specialists on these subjects find that my defence of the *Ha-Galuy* fragment is faulty, and that the genuineness of the book is doubtful.

(a) Saadiah's opponent Mubashir Halevy, who wrote after Saadiah's death (942), as noted by me in the first part (p. 68), cannot, of course, be identical with the Gaon Mubashir, as Prof. Margoliouth thinks. The latter Gaon was no Levite, and was already dead in 926.

(b) Saadiah's work, ספר ההכירה, quoted by Abraham bar Chija in

כהראב אלחמיין העבר, ספר העבר, was recognized long ago to be the Karaite book, which was written in Arabic, and directed against the Karaites. It is the same book as the one entitled *ספר המבחן*, in the translation of Moses ibn Ezra's מתקלאת אלחדיקות.

(c) Saadiah, like the Arabic authors, understood under *Nabataean* the Aramaic mixed with Aramaic and Persian words, which was spoken in Babylonia.

(d) Prof. Margoliouth's supposition that the *Galuy* fragment is a complete composition is obviously erroneous. Both its external shape and its contents (it commences in the middle of a phrase with the *vav* conjunctive) prove clearly that it is ἀκέφαλον καὶ ἀτέλευτον. The supposition is also refuted by the quotations from the work: הענותו, ומחמתה סעדיהו, ועיר ה' את רוח סעדיהו (p. 163), ויחל סעדיהו (p. 165), ולטם יתר הנבאים ונחותם חזון ונביא, (p. 167) טמורות (p. 161).

(e) Neither is the MS. whole, nor is it an autograph from the year 962, but it most likely belonged to a copyist of the twelfth century, who has not copied everything correctly.

(f) Prof. Margoliouth's positive assertion that Saadiah's book of the festivals was composed in Arabic, will hardly impress anybody, unable as he is to give a single quotation from it. He does not take any notice of the fragment printed by me (l. c., p. 220).

(g) Prof. Margoliouth's fantastical combination, about a Karaite fabrication of the *Galuy* fragment, is hardly worth a serious refutation. Not even the cleverest forger could have fabricated a literary production composed in Saadiah's style, written in words peculiar to Saadiah, and so thoroughly impregnated with the ideas and the spirit of Saadiah, let alone a Karaite of the tenth century.

In every Karaite forgery, both old and new, a great number of which the writer of these remarks has first recognized and pointed out, it is always an easy matter to find out the *cui prodest*, and the Karaite character is always more or less glaringly conspicuous. Where are the signs of Karaism in our fragment? Should its general object, the ridiculing of Saadiah, be its caricature? But it contains nothing which does not correspond with the Gaon's position at the time, or which could not *per se* be proved, from other works, to be his property. It would indeed be a rare curiosity in the history of Jewish literature, such a Karaite satire upon Saadiah, which was never used by a single one of the Gaon's many Karaite antagonists, but which was naïvely used by Nissim of Kairouan, a zealous Rabbinite of the first half of the eleventh century, who had constant intercourse with Babylonia, and who wrote polemical writings against the Karaites (vid. my remarks on this in Steinschneider's *Festschrift*). It would be a rarity far beyond anything hitherto considered rare.

(h) The unjust proceedings, which according to Nathan Babli's report, were the cause of the strife between Saadiah and the Exilarch, can only explain the latter's hatred against the former, but not the antagonism of the academy of Pumbeditha, of the Gaon Cohen Zedek, of the later Gaon Aaron (Chalaf) ibn Sarjado, and of all other opponents of Saadiah. We learn from the *Galuy* fragment—what the introduction to the *Amanath* already made appear probable—that Saadiah's learned aspiration was also one of the causes. There is, therefore, no contradiction between Nathan's report and the preface of *Ha-Galuy*. For the rest, the expression **וְלֹא עִזָּל** (*and no justice*) in the preface shows quite clearly, that justice had been infringed by Saadiah's opponents, and this subject was of course fully dealt with in the work *Ha-Galuy* itself.

(i) Prof. Margoliouth has overlooked the fact that the title of **אנצ'ראט אַלְתָּחוּד אַלְעָדָל** (people of monotheism and justice) was in reality the title borne by the Arabic *Mutakalemin*, and that it was appropriated by Mutakalemite Karaites from a love of imitation. This was known since Delitzsch (1841). Cf. also Schreiner, *Der Kalam* (Berlin, 1895, p. 5).

(k) Prof. Margoliouth disregarded also my remark about the title of **רַבִּין** (p. 153, note 10). There the matter is quite satisfactorily explained. Namely, Saadiah launches against his opponents Cohen Zedek, Sarjado, &c., the reproach, that they had no proper historical knowledge of Rabbinism, notwithstanding the fact that they now were called Rabbis and constantly had that title in their mouths. This is, therefore, directed against the *present Rabbis*, i. e. against Saadiah's opponents, and not against the Rabbis in general. How is it possible to recognize here, with Prof. Margoliouth, "the Karaite hand," and how is here "Saadiah's own party made ridiculous"?

(l) Prof. Margoliouth, in discussing David ben Zakkai's claims to the position of Exilarch, forgot that the latter had been first deprived of his office by Saadiah, and superseded by his brother, and that only afterwards David's party gained power, of course, by means of bribing the Mahomedan authorities. Consequently, Saadiah could justly consider Ben Zakkai as an illegitimate Exilarch.

(m) Prof. Margoliouth thinks it to be "impossible" for Saadiah to speak boastingly of himself, but he disregards the distinct evidence of Ibn Daud (in Neubauer's *Mediaev. Chron.*, I, 66), who says: "**וַיֹּתֶר רֵב סָעֲדִיה וְהַטְבָות אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה לִשְׂרָאֵל גַּם בְּחָכִים עַל סְפִר הַגְּלִילִי**." It may be that, according to our present ideas, one or another boastful expression may appear improper; but when we take into consideration the time when it was written, the literary fashion of the Arabic writers of the age, and the personal position of the Gaon, we shall become more lenient in our judgment.

(n) The readers of Saadiah's writings were long aware of the fact that he repeatedly dealt with many subjects in his various works. Abraham bar Chija gives distinct evidence (cf. my work, pp. 133, 143, 155) that Saadiah fully discussed the time of Israel's deliverance (the *YP*) both in *Ha-Galuy* and in the *Amanath*. Most probably he considered it necessary and useful to treat this subject in a pamphlet also, after having discussed it in his large work on philosophy of religion, which was only written for scholars. I have a conjecture about this, but it would lead me too far here to enter upon it. At any rate, it is unintelligible why the time of the deliverance when fixed by Saadiah as 933 may have been meant seriously, but when fixed as 934, it must, in spite of Abraham B. Chija's evidence, be put off to 962, and be meant satirically.

(o) It is true that Saadiah had done all he could to avoid the strife; but it became inevitable when it transpired that the Exilarch would not yield anything of his criminal demands, and made use of violent measures. On what compromise with the Exilarch could the Gaon enter after this?

(p) Everybody will think it only natural that Saadiah's polemic in the book *Amanath* and elsewhere is calmer, milder, and more modest than in *Ha-Galuy*. In the former, the polemic is not, as in the last, directed against personal enemies, who had taken everything away from him, who had personally illtreated him, had imperilled his life, and had publicly boasted that they had acted thus. And since Saadiah was usually calm and moderate, we can only conclude, that *Ha-Galuy* was a book written with a purpose (in self-defence against personal enemies), which if not justifiable, was at least excusable, in view of the conditions of the time.

The foregoing remarks are, I think, sufficient to set aside Prof. Margoliouth's principal strictures upon the *Galuy* fragment. Should it, however, be deemed necessary, I am prepared to disprove many other alleged proofs of Prof. Margoliouth. I only want to draw attention to this, that the assumption, that we have to deal here with a Karaite satire, entails greater difficulties than Prof. Margoliouth believes he has found. How is it possible that a Karaite satire against Saadiah existed since 962 without a Karaite having made use of it? That the famous head of a school in Kairouan of the eleventh century should have taken it, without any misgivings, for a genuine work, and should have borrowed from it forged verses of Ben Sira, and even Menasseh's argument, so strongly censured by Prof. Margoliouth! And we are to believe that this Karaite forger of the tenth century undertook the difficult task, without considering that any Rabbinit could unmask and disgrace him by producing the

genuine *Galuy!* Prof. Margoliouth may pardon me—but were it not that his esteemed name appeared at the bottom of the article, and if the latter did not contain some side issues, discussed with great erudition and acumen, it might be more reasonably taken as a satire against many a modern critic (especially in the field of Bible criticism), rather than the *Galuy* fragment as a satire against Saadiah.

A. HARKAVY.

ST. PETERSBURG, January, 1900.

#### NOTE ON SIRACH, L. 9.

THE editors of the Cambridge fragments of the Hebrew text of Ecclesiasticus (1899) discuss the best way of filling up בְּכָלֵי זהב...א...יל and suggest (p. xlvi) the reading בְּכָלֵי זהב חֲפִיעַ וּנְאַתִּיל (ככלי or) and suggest (p. xlvi) the reading בְּכָלֵי זהב חֲפִיעַ וּנְאַתִּיל (ככלי or) the reading בְּכָלֵי זהב חֲפִיעַ וּנְאַתִּיל (ככלי or) suggests as the last word נְאַתִּיל בְּכָסֶף. I venture to express the opinion that נְאַתִּיל is evidently a corruption of אַגְּרַטְל or אַגְּרַטְל. אַגְּרַטְל occurs in Ezra i. 9, where the versions (LXX, Vg., Syr.) give the sense "bowl" or "bason." The English Version gives "bowls of gold, silver bowls." Should we not read (correcting and transposing) ? אַגְּרַטְל בְּכָסֶף? So the sense becomes, "A vessel of gold and (or) a basin of silver."

March 15, 1900.

T. K. CHEYNE.